

**Public Information Meeting  
Proposed M-32 Spur Bridge  
Improvements  
July 27, 2006 – 3:30 p.m. to 7:00 p.m.  
Brush Creek Mill, Hillman**



**Introduction:**

The Michigan Department of Transportation (MDOT) has determined that the existing M-32 Spur Bridge is functionally obsolete and structurally deficient. The department is preparing an *Environmental Assessment and Programmatic Section 4(f) Evaluation* studying a range of possible alternatives and the possible environmental impacts each proposal may entail. The published document, along with public commentary, will be used to select a recommended alternative and develop the basis for the issuance of a Finding Of No Significant Impact (FONSI) by the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA).

**Environmental Assessment:**

An Environmental Assessment (EA) is a transparent process of gathering and analyzing data regarding a proposed project and the affected environment. The environment studied includes air and water quality, noise, threatened and endangered species, soils and hydrology, historic and archaeological resources; it also includes people. The EA will study the economic, social, and cultural make-up of the community. It will take into account community demographics and community values and vision.

The EA process is a dialogue between MDOT and the public, local officials and state and federal agencies that tests the various alternatives against the possible impacts to determine the alternative that best meets the purpose and need of the project with the least negative consequences. Public Involvement is essential to the MDOT decision-making process.

**Section 4(f) Evaluation:**

The M-32 Spur Bridge was built in 1922 from a design by the Michigan State Highway Department, forerunner of today's MDOT. It is 150 feet long, comprised of two 75' camelback spans. The prominent curved, or camelback, railings are integral to the structure.

According to the 1995 Michigan Historic Bridge Inventory, it was the fifth longest surviving example of a concrete camelback bridge designed by the highway department. The concrete camelback type is unique to Michigan and Ontario and was developed by C.V. Dewart, the highway department's first professional bridge engineer.

The bridge is eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP). Historic properties that are listed or eligible for listing on the NRHP are protected under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (1966, as amended) and Section 4(f) of the Department of Transportation Act (1966, as amended). Section 106 requires public consultation for projects using federal dollars or requiring federal permits that may adversely impact historic properties. Section 4(f) requires that a project using federal dollars or permits must be designed to avoid, minimize, or mitigate adverse impacts to historic properties while meeting the project Purpose and Need.

Section 4(f) evaluation will also be required to determine impacts, if any, to adjacent public recreational parkland. Because Emerick Park used federal assistance from the Land and Water Conservation Funds Act for several improvements additional coordination with the Department of the Interior would be required if impacts are identified.

### **Purpose & Need:**

The purpose of the proposed project is to correct operational and structural deficiencies of the existing historic bridge in order to maintain safe and efficient traffic flow in and out of Hillman.

The need to rehabilitate, expand, or replace the bridge is driven by specific deficiencies - functional obsolescence and structural deterioration. The existing two-lane bridge is twenty-feet wide and does not adequately accommodate wide vehicles crossing the bridge side-by-side. Although it is still structurally sound, the reinforced concrete structure has been damaged by over eighty years of weather and wear, and by intrusion of road salt. If structural deterioration is not corrected, vehicle weight limits may be necessary, precluding use by some vehicles.

### **Illustrative Alternatives:**

<b>Alternative 1</b>	No-build	Presumes no work beyond normal maintenance activities. This action would fail to address narrow lanes, and the bridge would continue to deteriorate. Weight limits would eventually be required, negatively impacting commercial, school and emergency vehicle use of the crossing. No right-of-way would be required.
<b>Alternative 2</b>	Restore existing bridge	This action would follow the Secretary of Interior Standards for the rehabilitation of historic structures and would require considerable remedial work to assure structural integrity. Alone this action would not correct functional obsolescence. Additional right-of-way, some or all

		temporary, might be needed for grading purposes to correct the steep grade on the south side. The bridge would be shared one-way controlled by signals or signs.
<b>Alternative 3A (West)</b>	Build one-lane bridge adjacent to and retain existing bridge	This alternative would provide a one-way pair and assumes the existing structure would be appropriately rehabilitated. Alternative 3A places the new structure to the west of the existing bridge and would require additional right-of-way, and would impact Section 4(f)/6(f) parkland. No detour would be required.
<b>Alternative 3B (East)</b>	Build one-lane bridge adjacent to and retain existing bridge	This alternative would provide a one-way pair and assumes the existing structure would be appropriately rehabilitated. Alternative 3A places the new structure to the east of the existing bridge and would require additional right-of-way, and would have residential and commercial relocations. No detour would be required.
<b>Alternative 4A (West)</b>	Build two-lane bridge adjacent to and retain existing bridge	The new bridge would carry motor vehicles only, the existing bridge would be rehabilitated for non-motorized traffic. Impacts described above in 3A would be increased. No detour would be required.
<b>Alternative 4B (East)</b>	Build two-lane bridge adjacent to and retain existing bridge	The new bridge would carry motor vehicles, the existing bridge would be rehabilitated for non-motorized traffic. Impacts described above in 3B would be the same or somewhat greater. No detour would be required.
<b>Alternative 5A (West)</b>	Build two-lane bridge adjacent to and demolish existing bridge	The new bridge would carry two-way vehicular traffic and would include accommodations for non-motorized traffic. Impacts would be similar to 4A. No detour would be required.
<b>Alternative 5B (East)</b>	Build two-lane bridge adjacent to and demolish existing bridge	The new bridge would carry two-way vehicular traffic and would include accommodations for non-motorized traffic. Impacts would be similar to 4B. No detour would be required.
<b>Alternative 6</b>	Build two-lane bridge on existing alignment	This Illustrative Alternative would require a detour or the use of an adjacent temporary crossing. A temporary crossing would require additional right-of-way on either the west or east side of the existing bridge. A

		detour would be of long duration, potentially long distance and may require roadway and/or bridge/culvert upgrades to accommodate heavy trucks. Requires demolition of historic bridge.
<b>Alternative 7</b>	Build new two-lane bridge on new alignment, rehabilitate existing bridge.	The location of the new alignment would likely be on a route with the closest proximity to the industrial park. Additional right-of-way would be required to accommodate construction of new roadway connections and possible upgrade of some existing roadway. This Illustrative Alternative would require substantial local participation.

### **Project Contacts:**

**Kevin Schaedig:** Development Engineer/Project Manager, MDOT Alpena TSC. Phone: 989-356-2231 FAX: 989-354-4142 Email: [schaedigk@michigan.gov](mailto:schaedigk@michigan.gov)

**Lloyd Baldwin:** Historian/Project Manager, MDOT Project Planning Division, Lansing. Phone: 517-241-2702 FAX: 517-373-9255 Email: [baldwinll@michigan.gov](mailto:baldwinll@michigan.gov)

**Robert Parsons:** Public Involvement/Public Hearings Officer, MDOT Project Planning Division, Lansing Phone: 517-373-9534 FAX: 517-373-9255 Email: [parsonsb@michigan.gov](mailto:parsonsb@michigan.gov)

### *Mailing Addresses:*

Michigan Department of Transportation, Alpena TSC  
1540 Airport Rd.  
Alpena, MI, 49707

Michigan Department of Transportation, Project Planning Division  
Van Wagoner Building  
425 W. Ottawa  
P.O. Box 30050  
Lansing, MI, 48933

### **Project Website:**

<http://www.michigan.gov/mdotstudies> and click on the project link “M-32 Spur Bridge Improvement Study.”